

REMARKS

Claims 16-22 are pending in the present application with claims 17 and 19 withdrawn. With entry of this Amendment, Applicants amend claims 16, 17, 21 and 22. Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

Rejections Under § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 16, 18, 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Philippe et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,643,624) in view of Ginter (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2006/0069926). The Examiner rejected claim 20 under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Philippe in view of Ginter and further in view of an Official Notice.

Claim 16

The present invention, as set forth in claim 16, is directed to a site computer. It allows a user to purchase items from a plurality of vendors belonging to different countries by accessing only one website. It thus avoids the need to access plural websites of plural countries to which plural vendors belong.

The site computer, as recited in amended claim 16, has a transmitting portion for transmitting “item list information for displaying an item list on one screen to the user computer, wherein the item list information shows at least one first item dealt by the first vendor, the first vendor belonging to a first country, and the name of the first country, and at least one second item dealt by the second vendor, the second vendor belonging to a second country different than the first country, and the name of the second country, the first and second items being copyrighted, whereby the user computer displays an item list based on the item list information.” (Emphasis added to show the amendment.)

Support for this recitation is found throughout the specification and drawings. For example, Fig. 5 illustrates a display on one screen of a user’s computer based on item list information transmitted by a site computer. The screen shows a MIDI collection soled by a vendor

in the UK and a piano score sold by a vendor in the US. That is, Fig. 5 shows at least two copyrighted items sold by two vendors belonging to two different countries and the country names of the vendors selling the two copyrighted items.

In contrast, in Philippe, there is no disclosure of a site computer that provides information for displaying on one screen an item list of items from at least two vendors in two different countries and the names of those two countries. Philippe discloses a process in which a user performs a search of items using a search program. The results of the search are displayed on the user's device, for example, as illustrated in Figs. 2C and 2D. The user can either select an item to buy or can place one or more items in a shopping cart. Once the user has made his or her selection, processing for performing the transaction is performed including filling out forms. (See, e.g., Col. 7, line 13 to Col. 8, line 8.)

As clearly shown in the list of items illustrated in Figs. 2C and 2D, there is no disclosure or suggestion of transmitting information to the user computer that displays an item list of items from at least two vendors in two different countries and the names of those two countries. What is shown in Figs. 2C and 2D is the product name and the name of the merchant.

It is believed that Ginter does not make up for the deficiencies of Philippe. Fig. 72D shows a screen listing properties and publishers. There is no disclosure or suggestion of displaying an item list of items from at least two vendors in two different countries and the names of those two countries.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 16 is patentable over Philippe and Ginter for at least the reasons set forth above.

Finally, Applicants have further amended claim 16 to better claim the invention. The phrase belonging to a country belonging to the first or second vendor has been amended to belonging to the first or second country.

Claims 17-20

Claims 17-20 depend from claim 16. In view of the patentability of generic claim 16 over Philippe and Ginter, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner consider claims 17 and 19 and allow them along with claims 18 and 20. Claim 17 has been amended to correct an informality.

Claims 21 and 22

Independent claims 21 and 22 have been amended in a manner similar to claim 16. It is believed that these claims are likewise in condition for allowance for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 16. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

If, for any reason, the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, Applicants request that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles telephone number (213) 892-5630 to discuss any steps necessary to place the application in condition for allowance.

In the unlikely event that the transmittal letter is separated from this document and the Patent Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, Applicants petition for any required relief including extensions of time and authorize the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing Docket No. 393032023900.

Dated: February 2, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Mehran Arjomand

Registration No.: 48,231
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
555 West Fifth Street, Suite 3500
Los Angeles, California 90013
(213) 892-5200